UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/508,809	04/07/2005	Robert George Dunster	14036.50USWO	6212

23552 7590 12/16/2008

MERCHANT & GOULD PC
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER	
BOECKMANN, JASON J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3752	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/508,809	DUNSTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jason J. Boeckmann	3752	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 September 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *3-14,18,24-26 and 30-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *6,8,10 and 11* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *3-5,7,9,12-14,18,24-26 and 30-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *22 September 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 3-5, 7, 9, 12-14, 18, 24-26 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dorkin et al. (WO99/52643) using USPN 6,478,240 for reference.

Dorkin et al. shows a fire and explosion suppression system, comprising: a source of pressurized liquid extinguishing agent (15), a source of a pressurized gas (16), a mist producing means (3) connected to receive a flow of the liquid extinguishing agent at a mass flow rate thereof to produce a mist therefrom mixing means (2) for mixing the already-produced mist into a flow of the pressurized gas to produce a discharge in the form of a two-phase mixture comprising a suspension of droplets of the mist in the pressurized gas, wherein the flow of the pressurized gas has a mass flow rate and the pressurized gas is pressurized by being stored under pressure which thus reduces during the flow thereof and reduces the mass flow rate of the gas, and a control means (20, 18) including means for applying the pressure of the stored gas to pressurize the liquid extinguishing agent (17) whereby the reducing applied pressure correspondingly reduces the mass flow rate of the liquid extinguishing agent so as to control the ratio of the mass flow rate of the liquid extinguishing agent to the mass flow

rate of the pressurized gas towards such a value (the set value) as to tend to produce a constant droplet size distribution in and for substantially the duration of the discharge, and a controllable valve (19) for adjusting the mass flow rate of the liquid agent during the discharge.

Regarding claims 3 and 9, the control means includes a means for applying the pressure of the stored gas to pressurize the liquid (17).

Regarding claim 7, the valve means comprises a controllable metering valve (20) for adjusting the valve in dependence of the mass flow rate of the gas.

Regarding claim 12, the liquid extinguishing agent flow is initiated before the gas flow (column 7, lines 40-45).

Regarding claim 32, the common pipe that the liquid and the gas flow mixture flow along is being considered element 1 of Dorkin, and the nozzle is being considered the outlet of element 1.

Regarding claims 18, and 24-26, the use of the apparatus of Dorkin et al inherently performs the steps and methods of the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorkin et al. (WO99/52643) using USPN 6,478,240 for reference, in view of Russwurn et al. (6,173,790).

Dorkin et al. shows all aspects of the applicant's invention as in claims 1 and 15, but does not specifically disclose that the pressurized gas in inert gas. However, Russwurn et al shows a fire-extinguishing device including pressurized gas that is inert and a liquid fire-extinguishing agent that is water. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention, under the teachings of Russwurn et al., to use inert gas in the fire suppression system of Dorkin et al., in order to extinguish a fire more quickly.

Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorkin et al. (WO99/52643) using USPN 6,478,240 for reference, in view of Sundholm (5,845,713).

Dorkin et al shows a device that in its use inherently provides a source of an extinguishing liquid (16) and a source of a pressurized extinguishing gas (15) so that a two-phase mixture comprising droplets of the liquid suspended in the gas is discharged from the nozzle, controls a ratio of a mass flow rate of the liquid to a mass flow rate of the gas towards a value to produce a desired droplet size (the desired droplet size can vary depending on how much fluid the device has dispensed) distribution in and for substantially a duration of the discharge, wherein the pressurized gas is pressurized by being stored under pressure which reduces during the flow thereof and reduces the

mass flow rate of the gas, and applies the pressure of the stored gas to pressurize the liquid (via pipe 17), whereby the reduced applied pressure correspondingly reduces the mass flow rate of the liquid extinguishing agent, but does not specifically teach causing the liquid and the gas to flow simultaneously along a common pipe to a plurality of nozzles.

However, Sundholm shows a device that mixes a gas an a liquid to travel through a common pipe (2) that branches off and goes to a plurality of nozzles (3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to add the common pipe and the plurality of nozzles, of Sundholm, down stream of the mixing chamber of Dorkin et al., in order to more widely distribute the fire extinguishing fluids.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/10/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the applicants remarks concerning the Dorkin reference, the applicant argues that the Dorkin reference does not specifically disclose or suggest a reduction in the applied pressure correspondingly reduces the mass flow rate of the gas, and that the mist is not formed before the liquid is introduces into the flow of the pressurized gas, however, the examiner respectfully disagrees. First of all, according to Dorkin, the regulator 18 decreases the pressure of the gas that is exiting the gas tank to a particular

range, not a specific value (column 7, lines 18-21). When the pressure in the tank is at its initial pressure the pressure of the gas leaving the tank is at the top of the said range, but when the pressure of the gas in the tank reduces (as it inherently will once gas leaves the tank), the pressure of the gas leaving the tank will fall from the top of the range to the bottom of the range, thereby inherently reducing the mass flow rate of the gas. Secondly, the applicant claims a mist producing means, in line 4 of claim 4, according to the specification, that mist producing means is element 13 in the figures which is a nozzle with a single or multiple orifices. In the Dorking reference the liquid under pressure (it is pressurized by the gas) flows through the circumferential openings shown in the liquid chamber 9, shown in figure 2, before interacting with the flowing gas. It is the examiners position that the circumferential openings, in the liquid chamber 9, are equivalent to the mist producing means of the device of the present invention, and therefore will inherently perform the same function as the mist nozzle if the liquid is provided at a high enough pressure.

Regarding the applicant's remarks concerning claims 12 and 24, the applicant argues that the Dorkin reference does not include a means for initiating the flow of liquid before initiating the flow of gas; however, the examiner respectfully disagrees. In the Specification of Dorkin, it is specifically disclosed that the air supply valve opens after the water supply valve (column 7, lines 40-45) because of a gap between the stop 35 and the opposite supporting surface. Because of that gap, the liquid has to begin flowing into the mixing chamber before the gas begins to flow into the mixing chamber, which means that the liquid flow is initiated before the gas flow.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason J. Boeckmann whose telephone number is (571)272-2708. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00- 5:00, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Len Tran can be reached on (571) 272-1184. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/J. J. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 3752
12/12/2008
/Len Tran/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3752